UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,081	12/21/2001	Anthony J. DeLuca	RA 5428 (USYS.032PA)	1589

27516	7590	04/28/2004	EXAMINER	

UNISYS CORPORATION
MS 4773
PO BOX 64942
ST. PAUL, MN 55164-0942

EXAMINER	
LY, ANH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	2

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/027,081	Applicant(s) DELUCA ET AL.
	Examiner Anh Ly	Art Unit 2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
 Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
 earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 December 2001_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
 closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.
　 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　 a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
　　 1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　 2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　 3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　　 application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is response to Applicants' communications filed on

12/21/2001.

2.   Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 1-3 and 5-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over US Patent No. 6,292,801 issued to Campbell et al. (hereinafter Campbell) in view

of US Patent No. 6,377,955 issued to Hartmann et al. (hereinafter Hartmann).

With respect to claim 1, Campbell teaches populating a database with selected

data elements of a plurality of data types (fig. 10, shown a plurality of category of

reports listed in the hierarchical directory as a database storing data types of a report;

also see col. 8, lines 1-26);

creating a database content table that indicates the data types of the data

elements present in the database (the history table of reports: col. 8, lines 1-26);

establishing a report table containing for each report a report identifier (see fig.

10, stored reports are listed under a directory interface); and

outputting a set of report identifiers for which the data types of data elements in

the database (the result of reports are sending to multiple destinations for user: col. 14,

lines 5-46).

Campbell discloses generating a report from a selection screen listing the

category or type of report to be generated via a reporting interface of report generator

with a listing of templates. The database or table of reports are listed as hierarchical

tree from which the users have to select the desired report to be generated via the GUI

for a directory interface to the report generator as shown in fig. 1, fig. 9 and fig. 10. Also

a history table stored all snapshot of reporting information for a period of time (col. 8,

lines 1-26) and the result set which is obtained by a report template on individual data

source elements (col. 13, lines 18-22 and lines 55-62). Campbell does not explicitly

teach a report identifier and an associated set of report requirements, each set of report requirements identifying a set of data types required for the associated report.

However, Hartmann teaches report type identifiers (col. 3, lines 10-35 such as performance characteristics of a computer network); a set of report requirements that are submitted by a user (col. 5, lines 20-22 and col. 7, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Campbell with the teachings of Hartmann so as to have a set of report requirements in order to generate a user desired a report such as a performance characteristics of a computer network, from the reporting interface as teaching of Campbell in fig. 10. The motivation being to generate and to control the reporting tools and to send a report generated by a report object to multiple destinations with GUI of reporting interface (Campbell col. 14, lines 5-46).

With respect to claim 2, Campbell teaches creating a report description table that associates report names with the 3 report identifiers; and displaying a list of report names that correspond to the set of report identifiers (see fig. 10, the name of a report in the stored report table is shown in the directory interface).

With respect to claim 3, Campbell teaches wherein the list of report names displayed are 2 selectable and linked to respective report functions that generate report data in accordance with predefined formats (see figs, 3A-3C and col. 6, lines 14-67).

With respect to claim 5, Campbell teaches establishing a report table (see fig. 10, stored reports are listed under a directory interface and log data is storing in a referential integrity of database such as a relational database: col. 9, lines 10-15);

reading selected log records from the log file; storing log data from the selected log records in a relational log-data database (obtaining the information from the data sources where the log file is stored; col. 5, lines 60-67 and col. 2, lines 45-60)

creating a database content table that indicates the log record types of the selected log records (the history table of reports: col. 8, lines 1-26); and

outputting the log data in the database content data table satisfies the set of report requirements of associated report definitions (the result of reports are sending to multiple destinations for user: col. 14, lines 5-46).

Campbell discloses generating a report from a selection screen listing the category or type of report to be generated via a reporting interface of report generator with a listing of templates. The database or table of reports are listed as hierarchical tree from which the users have to select the desired report to be generated via the GUI for a directory interface to the report generator as shown in fig. 1, fig. 9 and fig. 10. Also a history table stored all snapshot of reporting information for a period of time (col. 8, lines 1-26) and the result set which is obtained by a report template on individual data source elements (col. 13, lines 18-22 and lines 55-62). Campbell does not explicitly teach a set of report identifiers of reports and each set of report requirements including a set of log-record-type identifiers indicating which of the log record types contain log data required for the associated report.

However, Hartmann teaches report type identifiers (col. 3, lines 10-35 such as performance characteristics of a computer network); a set of report requirements that are submitted by a user (col. 5, lines 20-22 and col. 7, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Campbell with the teachings of Hartmann so as to have a set of report requirements in order to generate a user desired a report such as a performance characteristics of a computer network, from the reporting interface as teaching of Campbell in fig. 10. The motivation being to generate and to control the reporting tools and to send a report generated by a report object to multiple destinations with GUI of reporting interface (Campbell col. 14, lines 5-46).

With respect to claims 6-8, Campbell teaches each log record type of the selected log records, storing log data from the selected log records of the log record type in a respective log data table (col. 2, lines 45-67 and col. 5, lines 52-65 and col. 6, lines 1-14);

reading a plurality of sets of selected log records from the log file (col. 2, lines 43-65);

storing log data from the plurality of sets of selected log records in respective relational log-data databases (col. 5, lines 52-67 and col. 6, lines 1-12);

creating respective database content tables for the respective relational log-data databases (col. 2, lines 45-65, col. 5, lines 52-65 and col. 6, lines 1-14);

reading a plurality of sets of selected log records from the log file (col. 2, lines 43-65);

storing log data from the plurality of sets of selected log records in 4 respective relational log-data databases (col. 5, lines 52-67 and col. 6, lines 1-12);

creating respective database content tables for the respective relational 6 log-data databases (col. 2, lines 45-65, col. 5, lines 52-65 and col. 6, lines 1-14).

With respect to claims 9 and 11, Campbell teaches creating a report description table that associates report names with the report identifiers, and displaying a list of report names that correspond to the set of report identifiers (see fig. 10, the name of a report in the stored report table is shown in the directory interface).

With respect to claim 10 and 12, Campbell teaches wherein the list of report names displayed are selectable and linked to respective report functions that generate report data in accordance with predefined formats (see figs, 3A-3C and col. 6, lines 14-67).

With respect to claim 13, Campbell teaches reading selected log records from the log file in response to a first request that includes a first code indicating at least one user-specified log record type (obtaining the data from data sources and data resources in order to generating the log data for net work computer: col. 2, lines 43-65, col. 5, lines 52-67 and col. 6, lines 1-14);

transmitting the selected log records from the host system (transmitting the log data through the computer network: col. 5, lines 25-40);

establishing a report table containing for each report a report identifier and an

associated set of report requirements, each set of report requirements including a set of

log-record-type identifiers indicating which of the log record types contain log data

required for the associated report (see fig. 10, stored reports are listed under a directory

interface);

creating a database content table that indicates the log record types of the

selected log records (the history table of reports: col. 8, lines 1-26); and

outputting a set of report identifiers of reports for which the log data in the

database content data table satisfies the set of report requirements of associated report

definitions (the result of reports are sending to multiple destinations for user: col. 14,

lines 5-46).

Campbell discloses a system network for generating a report from a selection

screen listing the category or type of report to be generated via a reporting interface of

report generator with a listing of templates. The database or table of reports are listed

as hierarchical tree from which the users have to select the desired report to be

generated via the GUI for a directory interface to the report generator as shown in fig. 1,

fig. 9 and fig. 10. Also a history table stored all snapshot of reporting information for a

period of time (col. 8, lines 1-26) and the result set which is obtained by a report

template on individual data source elements (col. 13, lines 18-22 and lines 55-62).

Campbell does not explicitly teach converting log data from the selected log records to a

format suitable for storage in a relational database and storing the data of the second

format in a relational database by the log record types, wherein the selected log records

are converted and stored in the relational database at the second data processing

system, a second data processing system a report identifier and an associated set of

report requirements, each set of report requirements identifying a set of data types

required for the associated report.

However, Hartmann teaches a network system under client/server architecture

(col. 5, lines 31-62), converting data (col. 20, lines 1-16), a report type identifiers (col. 3,

lines 10-35 such as performance characteristics of a computer network); a set of report

requirements that are submitted by a user (col. 5, lines 20-22 and col. 7, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Campbell with the

teachings of Hartmann so as to have a set of report requirements in order to generate a

user desired a report such as a performance characteristics of a computer network,

from the reporting interface as teaching of Campbell in fig. 10. The motivation being to

generate and to control the reporting tools and to send a report generated by a report

object to multiple destinations with GUI of reporting interface (Campbell col. 14, lines 5-

46).

With respect to claims 14-15, Campbell teaches further comprising for each log

record type of the selected log records, storing log data from the selected log records of

the log record type in a respective log data table (col. 2, lines 45-67 and col. 5, lines 52-

65 and col. 6, lines 1-14);

reading a plurality of sets of selected log records from the log file (col. 2, lines 43-

65);

storing log data from the plurality of sets of selected log records in respective relational log-data databases (col. 5, lines 52-67 and col. 6, lines 1-12); and

creating respective database content tables for the respective relational log-data databases (col. 2, lines 45-65, col. 5, lines 52-65 and col. 6, lines 1-14).

With respect to claims 16-17, Campbell teaches creating a report description table that associates report names with the report identifiers, and displaying a list of report names that correspond to the set of report identifiers (see fig. 10, the name of a report in the stored report table is shown in the directory interface); and;

wherein the list of report names displayed are selectable and linked to respective report functions that generate report data in accordance with predefined formats (see figs, 3A-3C and col. 6, lines 14-67).

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 19 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method ('955 storing data in order: col. 21, lines 18-32 and col. 18, lines 5-8; multiple application programs; col. 5, lines 55-67 and col. 6, lines 1-14), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 13 hereinabove.

6.   Claims 4, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US

Patent No. 6,292,801 issued to Campbell et al. (hereinafter Campbell) in view of US

Patent No. 6,377,955 issued to Hartmann et al. (hereinafter Hartmann) and further in

view of US Patent No. 6,643,635 issued to Nwabueze.

With respect to claim 4, Campbell in view of Hartmann discloses a method for

report selection as discussed in claim 1.

Campbell discloses generating a report from a selection screen listing the

category or type of report to be generated via a reporting interface of report generator

with a listing of templates. The database or table of reports are listed as hierarchical

tree from which the users have to select the desired report to be generated via the GUI

for a directory interface to the report generator as shown in fig. 1, fig. 9 and fig. 10. Also

a history table stored all snapshot of reporting information for a period of time (col. 8,

lines 1-26) and the result set which is obtained by a report template on individual data

source elements (col. 13, lines 18-22 and lines 55-62). Campbell does not explicitly

teach a report identifier and an associated set of report requirements, each set of report

requirements identifying a set of data types required for the associated report.

Hartmann teaches report type identifiers (col. 3, lines 10-35 such as performance

characteristics of a computer network); a set of report requirements that are submitted

by a user (col. 5, lines 20-22 and col. 7, lines 1-5). In combination, Campbell and

Hartmann do not teach the selected data element from a sequential file prior to

populating the database.

However, Nwabueze teaches the raw data of the data sources from which a report is produced is stored in a flat file such as log file: col. 12, lines 30-58 and col. 13, lines 52-67 and col. 14, lines 1-34; also see fig. 5, and figs. 7-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Campbell in view of Hartmann with the teachings of Nwabueze so as to have a raw data of the data sources from which the report is produced from these raw data, storing under a flat file as a log file and a set of report requirements in order to generate a user desired a report such as a performance characteristics of a computer network, from the reporting interface as teaching of Campbell in fig. 10. The motivation being to generate and to control the reporting tools and to send a report generated by a report object to multiple destinations with GUI of reporting interface (Campbell col. 14, lines 5-46).

Contact Information

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is 703 306-4527 or via
E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM -
4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on 703 305-9790. The fax phone number for
the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703 746-7239.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: Central Office (703) 872-9306 (Central Official Fax Number)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-
6606 or 703 305-3900.

ANH LY
APR. 21st, 2004

JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER